DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 456 IR 021 957

AUTHOR	Stevenson, Mary J.
TITLE	An Analysis of the Mentor Survey.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Measures; *Attitudes; *Distance Education; Higher Education; *Mentors; *Online Courses; Questionnaires ; Surveys; *Web Based Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	Florida State University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitude of mentors toward Florida State University (FSU) mentor-supported online courses. The study was limited to analyzing the data of the Mentor Survey that was conducted at FSU during the spring semester of 2002. This instrument surveyed the attitudes and experiences of FSU mentors who participated in the program. Specifically, the survey gathered data about: (1) which course(s) the participant was mentoring; (2) how many terms the participant has mentored; (3) the number of hours spent weekly in various mentoring activities; (4) how useful 12 course components were in helping students achieve the course objectives; (5) suggestions for how or if the Office of Distributed and Distance Learning (ODDL) should improve mentor support; (6) the value of the Mentor Resource Web site; and (7) the value of the Mentor Handbook. It is concluded that mentors are pivotal to the success of online degree programs and that research needs to be conducted concerning what the lead faculty, technical support staff, and the ODDL staff could do to make the position of mentor more productive and rewarding. A copy of the questionnaire and tabulated results are appended. (MES)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 477 456

Mary J. Stevenson

An Analysis of the Mentor Survey

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the attitude of mentors towards Florida State University (FSU) mentor-supported online courses.

Background

Many educational researchers believe that distance learning is going to be a permanent part of education and training because of the many advantages it offers. Distance education courses have the potential to reach a wider audience than traditional face-to-face courses. This makes it possible to link students in a course from varying social and cultural backgrounds and different geographic locations. Distance education also meets the needs of students who are unable to attend class on a college campus or at a school. Distance education makes it possible for an instructor in a highly specialized area to be available to students in remote areas. Finally, while start-up costs are high, in the long run, distance education is cost effective, primarily due to economy of scale. One instructor can be made available to more students, and more students can be in a particular course (Willis, 2001).

Despite the many advantages of distance education, research shows that both instructors and students prefer face-to-face courses rather than distance education courses. Instructors are reluctant to develop distance education courses and/or convert existing face-to-face courses to distance education courses. Many of them feel that developing and conducting an online course is more time-consuming than a traditional face-to-face course. As a result, instructors often feel they are not allotted sufficient time to properly develop and maintain an online course (Moore & Thompson, 1990).

Like their instructors, research shows that most learners prefer to take a traditional course rather than a distance education course (Moore & Thompson, 1990). The students cite many reasons for preferring traditional face-to-face courses, including the perception that distance courses are more work and require greater technology skills than what they feel they have (Simonson, M., Smaldino, S, Albright, & Zvacek, S, 2000). In online courses and other types of distance education, the students are often frustrated by their inability to contact the instructor. Research supports the need for timely teacher-to-student feedback and communication, which has been shown to be one of the most important contributing factors to a successful distance learning program (Moore & Thompson, 1990).

IR021957

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.J. Stevenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Distance learning is already having a tremendous impact on the field of education, and this effect will continue and grow in the future. Thus, it is important that the concerns that instructors and students have about distance learning be identified. It is also important that promising practices that have the potential of increasing the effectiveness of distance learning be studied and possibly modeled at other educational institutions.

Description of Mentor Program at FSU

There are four undergraduate programs at FSU in which one can earn a degree online without attending classes on campus. These programs are: Computer Science, Information Studies, Interdisciplinary Social Science, and Nursing. The mentor-supported online courses are supported by the Office of Distributed and Distance Learning (ODDL) at FSU, with the exception of the School of Nursing, which supports its own mentors. This online degree program at FSU is called the 2 + 2 Program. Students earn an Associate of Arts (A. A.) or Associate of Science (A. S.) degree at a community college. They take their last two years of course work online to earn a degree from FSU. This program greatly enhances the accessibility of a college education for people who are unable to leave their work and family responsibilities for two years to establish residence in a university town and take classes on campus. Even people who do not have these family or work-related responsibilities are often unable to take classes on campus due to financial limitations or disabilities. ODDL makes sure that the quality of these online courses is equal to the face-to-face version of the courses (Easton, 2000).

While FSU has provided various types of distance learning for over 25 years, mentor-supported online courses began Fall Semester 1999, shortly after ODDL was established (Easton, 2000). The mentor program was designed to alleviate many of the problems that instructors and students have with online courses. In order for students to be successful in online courses, they need good communication with the instructional staff, as well as feedback on the quality of their work. They also need help in feeling comfortable in an online environment and confidence to know that they can succeed. They often need help in handling administrative and logistical problems associated with being a distance education student. Finally, online students need to feel that they are a part of the university community, even though they may live far from the campus.

Instructors conducting online courses also have concerns that must be addressed. Conducting online courses is more work for the instructor than face-to-face courses, primarily because of the need to have good communication with students and to provide frequent feedback. Mentors can help meet the needs of the students and instructors to insure that the online experience is a positive one for all concerned.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

FSU pioneered the concept of mentor-supported online courses in the United States, and is one of the few universities in this country that implements this concept formally (Hayes, March 2002). As the idea of offering online degree programs was being explored, FSU staff studied the models of two of the largest and fastest-growing providers of distance education degree programs in the country, Nova Southeastern University and University of Phoenix. Neither of these universities uses mentors or tutors. Instead, the instructors work directly with the students. FSU then looked outside the United States for providers of distance education degree programs. The FSU mentor program is modeled after the tutor concept of the British Open University. Staff members from FSU visited the British Open University in 1995 to determine which aspects of this program could be replicated or adapted to FSU online programs (Easton, 2000). The tutor program at the British Open University seemed to provide the type of support that would be useful for FSU students. The purpose of the mentor is to: 1) develop rapport and instill trust in his or her online student group; 2) clarify course content; 3) establish a learning community amongst his/her cohort of students; and 4) access resources to find solutions to administrative and logistical problems. Mentors are required to communicate frequently with their cohort of students, and to respond to their telephone calls or e-mail within 48 hours. Mentors are also expected to provide guidance and feedback to students as they learn to master the online environment, which in the case of FSU, is the Blackboard course management system. FSU mentors also provide invaluable support to the online instructors. The mentor is the student's first point of contact, reducing the amount of time the instructor needs to spend in communicating with students. In most cases, the mentors also grade assignments and tests (Hayes, 2002).

FSU online mentors are geographically dispersed around Florida, and some are in Tallahassee. They generally have a master's degree in the content area of the course they are mentoring. Being a mentor is often a doctoral student's graduate assistantship assignment. Other mentors are community college instructors or retired people. Besides having content expertise, mentors must have excellent communication skills. While they must be computer proficient, they are not expected to replace technical support personnel. A two-day workshop on FSU's campus is held each May to provide training. Prospective mentors must attend the workshop even if they have experience, and even if they attended the workshop previously. This workshop includes training in the Blackboard course management system, communicating in an online environment, and understanding the adult learner. The mentor also learns about the resources available to him or her, including the Mentor Handbook and the Mentor Website. Finally, the mentors spend an entire day with the lead faculty member whose course they will be mentoring (Hayes, 2002).

The staff that supports the FSU online programs includes the lead faculty member, the academic coordinator, the mentor, the mentor coordinator, the

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

technical support personnel, and the implementation team. As with the instructor of any course, the lead faculty member has the ultimate responsibility and authority for the course, including being responsible for developing the course content, delivering the instruction, and evaluating the students. While the lead faculty may allow the mentor to grade assignments under his/her supervision, the lead faculty member is responsible for this activity. There is one academic coordinator for each department that offers an online degree program. This person is the link between the department offering the online degree program and the students. This person is responsible for administrative functions and academic guidance, including program requirements, graduation checks, and course prerequisites. The mentor coordinator is responsible for conducting the mentor-training program and providing each mentor with the resources needed to be effective in his/her role. The Coordinator of External Relations coordinates the resources of ODDL in supporting the online programs, conducts various surveys of students and mentors involved in online programs, and supervises the mentor coordinator and the implementation team. The implementation team works with the lead faculty member to develop, maintain, update, and review the course and instructional materials, construct and maintain websites, and offer technical assistance (Mentor Handbook, 2001).

The success of an online course is often measured by the percentage of students who complete the course and by the number of students who earn a satisfactory grade. At FSU, the retention rate has increased each year since the mentor-supported online courses began, as has the success rate. Success rate is defined as students completing the course with a grade of C minus or higher. During the 1999 - 2000 academic year, 87 percent of students completed mentor-supported online courses with a success rate of 83 percent. During the 2000 - 2001 academic year, 93 percent of students completed mentor-supported online courses with a success rate of 87 percent (Hayes, 2002). In the fall semester of 2001, 94 percent of students completed mentor-supported online courses. The vast majority of these online course completers, about 65 to 75 percent, earned a grade of A or B (Hayes, April 2002). Since ODDL was just established in July of 1999, no data was collected on the retention rate or success rate of students in online courses at FSU before the fall semester of 1999. While there were online courses before the fall of 1999, they were not a part of an online degree program. Beginning with the fall semester of 1999, the Blackboard course management system was designated as the platform that would be used by FSU online degree programs and supported by ODDL (Hayes, 2002).

Scope and Focus of Study

This study is limited to analyzing the data of the Mentor Survey that was conducted at FSU during the Spring Semester of 2002 by ODDL. This instrument surveyed the attitudes and experiences of FSU mentors who participated in the

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

program. There was a 47 percent response rate with 20 of the 42 mentors submitting surveys. Because the mentor program is pivotal to the success of the FSU online course program, it is important to survey and analyze the experiences, perceptions, and concerns of the mentors. See Appendix A for the survey instrument.

Analysis of the Results of the Mentor Survey

The first item on the survey asks which course(s) the person is mentoring this semester. The second item is: "How many terms have you mentored including this one?" The third item on the survey is: "Estimate the number of hours you spent weekly in different kinds of activities." The three variables that this researcher thought would effect the hours spent per week were: 1) the number of students the respondents were mentoring, 2) the amount of experience the respondents had as a mentor, and 3) the course they were mentoring. The survey does not ask how many students were being mentored, so there is no data available to determine if this was a factor. The researcher expected to find that the more experience the person had as a mentor, the less time they would spend each week in mentor-related activities, but this was not necessarily the case. The total amount of time ranged from a high of 31 hours per week for a person in his/her first term as a mentor to a low of three hours per week for a person in his/her second term as a mentor. The second highest amount of time spent was 30 hours per week for a person in his/her third term as a mentor. The second lowest amount of time spent on mentor-related activities was 8.1 hours per week for a person mentoring for the first time. Interestingly, the person who spent 30 hours per week and the one who spent 8.1 hours per week were both mentors for the same course, LIS 4351, Interface Design for Information Specialists. Otherwise, no patterns emerged concerning the amount of time the mentors spent and the courses they were mentoring (see Table I).

While 20 people responded to the survey, one person did not answer any of the items about the amount of time spent in mentor-related activities. Three of the people were mentoring two courses, so the amount of time they reported was divided in half, so that an estimate of the amount of time they spent each week per course could be determined. The average amount of time for all 19 mentors was 15.20 hours per week. The mentors who spent the greatest amount of time each week were people who had three semesters of experience. These three people averaged 21 hours per week. Except for these three people, the total average number of hours spent per week decreased with experience. The two people with five or more semesters of experience averaged 8.75 hours; those with four terms of experience averaged 12 hours; those with two terms averaged 12.90 hours; and those who were in their first term as a mentor averaged 19.17 hours per week. The mentors reported that the most time-consuming activity was "grading/giving feedback on student assignments," for which they spent an average of 5.36 hours

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

per week. The other seven activities ranged from an average high of 2.65 hours per week, "answering student question on course content," to an average of .47 hours per week, "dealing with technical problems."

Table I:
Average Hours per Week and Number of Terms of Mentor Experience

Terms of Experience	Course(s) Taught	Avg. Hours Per Week
Average Hours Per Week with 5 Terms of Experience		**8.75**
5	LIS 3267 – Information Science	9.00
5	COP 4530 – Data Structure, Algorithms	8.50
Average Hours Per Week with 4 Terms of Experience		**12.00**
4	LIS 4482 – Managing Networks & Telecomm.	15.00
4	ACG 3101 – Financial Accting. & Reporting I	12.00
4	LIS 3267 – Information Science, LIS 4351 – Interface Des. for Information Spec.	11.00*
4	LIS 3267 – Information Science	10.00
Average Hours Per Week with 3 Terms of Experience		**21.00**
3	LIS 4351 – Interface Des. For Information Spec.	30.00
3	LIS 4276 – Quant. Methods in Information Sci.	23.00
3	ACG 2021 – Intro. to Financial Accounting	10.00
Average Hours Per Week with 2 Terms of Experience		**12.90**
2	COP 3331 – Object-Oriented Analysis & Design COT 4420 – Theory of Computation	20.00*
2	ACG 3111 – Financial Accting. & Reporting II	16.00
2	ACG 2071 – Intro. to Managerial Accounting	15.00
2	COM 3332 – New Communication Technology MMC 4210 – Media Legalities	10.50*
2	ECP 3203 – Labor Economics	3.00
Average Hours Per Week with 1 Term of Experience		**19.17**
1	COT 4425 – Formal Methods in Software Eng.	31.00
1	SYO 4550 – Comparative Sociology	27.75
1	LIS 4351 – Interface Des. For Information Spec.	16.00
1	COM 3332 – New Communication Technology	13.00
1	LIS 4351 – Interface Des. For Information Spec.	8.10
Average Hours Per Week for All Mentors		**15.20**

* If person was mentoring two classes, amount of time reported was divided in half to determine the average amount of time spent per week per class.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

The next section of the survey used a five-point scale to determine how useful 12 course components were in helping students to achieve the course objectives. There was only one component with a mean below 4.00. CD-ROM materials had a mean of 3.90, which means this component fell between "Undecided/ Neutral" and "Sometimes Useful." All of the other components had means ranging from a low of 4.10 for "External Links from Course Website" to a high of 4.83 for "Textbook." This range of means fell between "Sometimes Useful" and "Often Useful." Some mentors responded "N/A" if that component was not used in the course. However, it appears that the mentors considered all components that were used in the course to be useful. The remaining eight fixed-response items involved the mentor ranking the course content, organization, goals and objectives, and assessment. The statement in this section with the lowest mean of 4.05 was: "Students clearly understood the course goals and objectives." The statement in this section with the highest mean of 4.50 was: "During the course students had sufficient feedback about the quality of their coursework." Thus, all of the responses fell between "Agree" and "Strongly Agree." It appears that the mentors gave a positive evaluation to the course content, organization, goals and objectives, and assessment. See Appendix B for results of the fixed-item responses on the survey.

The final section of the Mentor Survey included the following three open-ended items:

- Do you have any suggestions for improving Mentor Support for this course?
- Please comment on the value of the Mentor Resource Website.
- Please comment on the value of the Mentor Handbook.

None of the mentors provided any responses to the three open-ended items. However, Ms. Hayes did provide this researcher the transcript of an audio conference that she had with mentors in October of 2001. From this transcript, one could infer their responses to the first two items, although they made no comments about the Mentor Handbook. They made several suggestions for improving mentor support. One mentor reported that communication between the mentors and lead faculty in her course was poor. The lead faculty was unresponsive and uncommunicative with mentors. This made it difficult for the mentor to provide the students with the support they needed. Student rosters were incorrect and incomplete. Only one of the five members involved in the audio conference had these problems with the lead faculty. It was decided that the mentor coordinator should intercede on behalf of the mentor. Most of the comments were about the Blackboard course management system. The e-mail (EMU mail) system does not work well. There are problems with the grade book part of the Blackboard system. The mentors would like to be able to freeze the student name and column titles as they scroll down and across the spreadsheet.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Also, some mentors would like to keep a hard copy of their cohort of students from the grade book. As it stands now, one must print out the entire class enrollment. There is no record archived for a student if he or she is accidentally dropped from the course. This happened recently, and when the student was re-enrolled, all data concerning his participation was lost. Despite these comments, the mentors agreed that Blackboard is a wonderful tool. Mentors feel they need more encouragement from ODDL. They want to be informed of the impact of their work on student retention and performance. A few comments were made on the value of the Mentor Website. The mentors said they were not inclined to visit the site after spending much time on their course sites. They appreciated receiving e-mail announcements when additions were made to the site. One person suggested providing a link from the course site to the Mentor Website. No comments were made about the Mentor Handbook.

Description of Student Course Evaluation Survey.

Like the Mentor Survey, the first item of the Student Course Evaluation Survey asks for the number and title of the online course taken by the student. There is also a section that asks the student to rank each of 12 course components in terms of usefulness in helping him/her achieve course objectives. This section is nearly identical to items on the Mentor Survey, except that the student responds from a personal point of view. However, the mentor is asked to make a judgment as to how useful these 12 components would be for a student. Like the Mentor Survey, each of these components on the Student Course Evaluation Survey is ranked on a five-point scale: Often Useful, Sometimes Useful, Undecided/Neutral, Rarely Useful, Never Useful, and N/A. Both surveys include seven fixed-response items in which the student and mentor rank the course content, organization, goals and objectives, and assessment on a five-point scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided/Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Like the Mentor Survey, the Student Survey includes free-response items for the student to make an entry in a textbox.

The Student Course Evaluation Survey includes additional items which have no equivalent on the Mentor Survey, including 12 items asking the student to evaluate the mentor on a 5-point scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided/Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. These items are as follows:

- My mentor demonstrated fundamental computer and Internet literacy.
- My mentor was knowledgeable in the course content area.
- My mentor effectively facilitated and monitored threaded and/or live discussion.
- My mentor initiated and maintained contact with me.
- My mentor graded my work fairly.
- My mentor provided timely feedback on my assignments.
- My mentor's feedback helped me improve my subsequent performance.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

- My mentor was prompt in responding to my questions.
- My mentor was responsive to my challenges and needs.
- My mentor worked with me and provided me learning guidance.
- My mentor was important in helping me achieve the course goals.
- My mentor was helpful in referring me to the right resource for academic and administrative issues.

The Student Course Evaluation Survey was carefully reviewed as a part of this study. It did not appear that anything was missing from this instrument, and no additions were recommended for the next administration of the survey.

Recommendations

Carole Hayes, the Coordinator of External Relations for ODDL, oversees the FSU mentor-supported online program. She gave this researcher the opportunity to review the Mentor Survey and provide input prior to its distribution during the Spring Semester of 2002. The only item added was the following: "How many terms have you mentored including this one?" In analyzing the results, it would be important to know the amount of experience the respondents had as a mentor. Now that this researcher has become more familiar with the mentor program and the survey, it is recommended that two additional items be added for the next administration of the survey. These items are as follows:

- How many students are you mentoring per course?
- The two-day mentor certification workshop prepared me well to be a mentor.
  Strongly Agree Agree Undecided/Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Responses to the first of these items would help a researcher to better analyze the factors influencing the amount of time per week that the mentor spends in mentor-related activities. The second of these items relates to how well the mentors feel the two-day workshop prepared them for their responsibilities. While the mentors complete an extensive evaluation at the end of the workshop, at that point, many of the participants have had no experience as a mentor. It is important to learn whether they feel the workshop prepared them for their responsibilities once they have had experience as a mentor in an online course. Also, most of the survey was an evaluation of the course(s) they were mentoring. Items concerning what the lead faculty, technical support staff, and the ODDL staff could do to make the position of mentor more productive and rewarding would be useful in revising the mentor program.

The focus of this study is on the Mentor Survey. As a follow-up study, it would be interesting to compare the results of the Students Course Evaluation Survey with the Mentor Survey, since large portions of the two surveys include equivalent items.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Conclusions

The experiences of the British Open University and the FSU online degree programs show that providing tutors or mentors is important to the success of these programs. Research shows that providing students answers to their questions and timely feedback on their performance is crucial to the success of online programs. Developing and maintaining online courses is much more labor intensive for the instructor than traditional face-to-face courses. The primary role of the mentor or tutor is to develop a sense of community among their cohort of students through good communication and timely feedback. This is imperative to the retention of students and their successful completion of online courses. When most of the communication with students is handled by mentors, this reduces the workload of the instructors so that they can concentrate on developing the course content and delivering the instruction. At the present time, mentors are only used to support online courses at FSU in four undergraduate programs: Computer Science, Information Studies, Interdisciplinary Social Science, and Nursing. However, FSU does have graduate online degree programs, including a master's degree program in Distributed and Distance Learning from the Instructional Systems program. However, these graduate programs are not mentor-supported. The rationale for providing mentors at the undergraduate level applies to the graduate level, as well. While graduate students are generally more mature and self-directed, they also tend to be less proficient in technology. Graduate students need good communication, timely feedback, and encouragement as much as undergraduate students when venturing into the unfamiliar terrain of online degree programs.

Since it is evident that mentors are pivotal to the success of online degree programs, research needs to be conducted concerning what the lead faculty, technical support staff, and the ODDL staff could do to make the position of mentor more productive and rewarding. Distance education offers many advantages, including the accessibility of a college education to a wider audience. Thus, it is important that promising practices, such as FSU's program of using mentors to support online degree programs, be expanded, improved, and replicated at other educational institutions.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

References

Easton, S. S. (2000). Defining and negotiating roles in a complex virtual organization: A case study of instructors and mentors in the Florida State University 2 + 2 distance learning initiative. Tallahassee, FL: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Hayes, C.A. E-mail correspondence of April 4, 2002.

Hayes, C.A. Interviews of March 15, 2002, and March 27, 2002.

Hayes, C.A. (2002). The role of the mentor in retention of online students. Tallahassee, FL: Unpublished document.

Moore, M.G. & Thompson, M.M., with Quigley, A.B., Clark, G.C., & Goff, G.G. (1990). The effects of distance learning: A summary of the literature. Research Monograph No. 2. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, American Center for the Study of Distance Education (ED 330 321).

Office of Distributed and Distance Learning, Florida State University (2001). Mentor handbook. Tallahassee, FL: Unpublished document.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S, Albright, & Zvacek, S. (2000). Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Willis, B. (2001). Guide # 2 - Distance education at a glance: Strategies for teaching at a distance. Boise, Idaho: University of Idaho.

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Appendix A

Mentor Survey
Spring 2002 Courses and Support

1. Which Spring 2002 course(s) are you mentoring?

Course Number and Title
ACG 2021 - Introduction to Financial Accounting
ACG 2071 - Introduction to Managerial Accounting
ACG 3101 - Financial Accounting and Reporting I
ACG 3111 - Financial Accounting and Reporting II
COP 4530 - Data Structure, Algorithms
CDA 3101 - Computer Organization
COT 4420 - Theory of Computation
COT 4425 - Formal Methods in Software Engineering
COP 3331 - Object-Oriented Analysis and Design
ECP 3203 - Labor Economics
SYA 4300 - Methods of Social Research
SYO 4550 - Comparative Sociology
LIS 3267 - Information Science
LIS 4351 - Interface Design for Information Specialists
COM 3332 - New Communication Technology
LIS 4276 - Quantitative Methods in Information Science
LIS 4482 - Managing Networks & Telecommuncation
MMC 4210 - Media Legalities Other
(Please Specify Below) Other:

2. How many terms have you mentored including this term?

1 term

2 terms

3 terms

4 terms

5+ terms

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

3. Please estimate the number of hours you spent weekly in different kinds of activities. (For each type of activity, please enter the estimated hours per week in the space provided.)

	Hours per Week
About how many *total hours per week* do you spend on mentor-related activities?	
Grading/giving feedback on student assignments	
Answering student questions on course content	
Contacting students who have been out-of-touch or have not been participating in course activities; encouraging students	
Referring students to other resources (e.g., academic coordinators, FSU Bookstore, technical help)	
Managing online discussions	
Dealing with technical problems (e.g., retrieving student work, helping students solve their computer/site-related problems)	
Other types of interactions with students and approximate total hours spent on all other interactions	
About how many hours per week did you spend learning/studying course material?	

4. How useful were the following course components in helping students achieve the course objectives? (Please select the term that best describes your opinion. If a component was not part of the course, please select "N/A".)

Course Component	Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/ Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A
Student Handbook for Online Learning						
Course Readings						
External Links from Course Website						
Textbook						
CD-ROM Materials						
Lectures (online)						
Online Threaded Discussions						
Individual Projects/Exercises/ Assessments (Graded)						
Collaborative Projects/Exercises/ Assessments (Graded)						
Peer Exchanges Online						
Self-Checking Online Quizzes/Exercises (Not Graded)						
Test/Quizzes (Graded)						

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Please indicate the choice that best describes your opinion on the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagr
5. The course content was clearly and accurately presented.					
6. The course content was well organized.					
7. Students understood the criteria that were used to evaluate their assignments.					
8. During the course students had sufficient feedback about the quality of their participation in discussion.					
9. During the course students had sufficient feedback about the quality of their coursework.					
10. The course assessments (e.g. graded activities, tests, quizzes) effectively measured student achievement in this course.					
11. Students clearly understood the course goals and objectives.					
12. Lead Faculty provided me enough guidance to grade student assignments consistently.					

13. Do you have any suggestions for how or if ODDL should improve mentor support?

14. Please comment on the value of the Mentor Resource Website?

15. Please comment on the value of the Mentor Handbook?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Appendix B

Results of Mentor Survey
Spring 2002 Courses and Support

1. Which Spring 2002 course are you mentoring?

Course Number and Title	# of Mentors	# of Terms as a Mentor	Comment
ACG 2021 - Introduction to Financial Accounting	1	3	
ACG 2071 - Introduction to Managerial Accounting	1	2	
ACG 3101 - Financial Accounting and Reporting I	1	4	
ACG 3111 - Financial Accounting and Reporting II	1	2	
COP 4530 - Data Structure, Algorithms	1	5+	
CDA 3101 - Computer Organization	0		
COT 4420 - Theory of Computation	1	2	Also mentors COP 3331
COT 4425 - Formal Methods in Software Engineering	1	1	
COP 3331 - Object-Oriented Analysis and Design	1	2	Also mentors COT 4420
ECP 3203 - Labor Economics	1	2	
SYA 4300 - Methods of Social Research	0		
SYO 4550 - Comparative Sociology	1	1	
LIS 3267 - Information Science	3	5+, 4, 4	One person also mentors LIS 4351
LIS 4351 - Interface Design for Information Specialists	4	4, 3, 1, 1	One person also mentors LIS 3267
COM 3332 - New Communication Technology	2	1, 2	One person also mentors MMC 421(
LIS 4276 - Quantitative Methods in Information Science	1	3	
LIS 4482 - Managing Networks & Telecommunications	1	4	
MMC 4210 - Media Legalities	2	2, 2	One person also mentors COM 3332
Other (Please Specify Below):	0		
Total	23		20 respondents, 3 o whom are mentorin courses

2. How many terms have you mentored including this term?
   1 term = 5
   2 terms = 6
   3 terms = 3
   4 terms = 4
   5+ terms = 2

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Please estimate the number of hours you spent weekly in different kinds of activities. (For each type of activity, please enter the estimated hours per week in the space provided.)

	Hours per Week Range			
	High	Low	Average	Rank
About how many *total hours per week* do you spend on mentor-related activities?	31.00	3.00	15.20	
Grading/giving feedback on student assignments	15.00	0	5.36	1
Answering student questions on course content	10.00	0	2.65	2
Contacting students who have been out-of-touch or have not been participating in course activities; encouraging students	5.00	0	1.02	5
Referring students to other resources (e.g., academic coordinators, FSU Bookstore, technical help)	1.00	0	.48	7
Managing online discussions	8.00	0	1.87	4
Dealing with technical problems (e.g., retrieving student work, helping students solve their computer/site-related problems)	1.00	0	.47	8
Other types of interactions with students and approximate total hours spent on all other interactions	3.00	0	.94	6
About how many hours per week did you spend learning/studying course material?	4.00	0	2.30	3

Responses from 19 of the 20 mentors

4. How useful were the following course components in helping students achieve the course objectives? (Please select the term that best describes your opinion. If a component was not part of the course, please select "N/A".)

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Student Handbook for Online Learning

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
8	6	3	0	0	3	17	4.29

Course Readings

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
14	3	0	0	0	3	17	4.82

Textbook

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
15	3	0	0	0	2	18	4.83

CD-ROM Materials

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
4	3	2	0	1	10	10	3.90

External Links from Course Website

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
6	9	4	0	0	1	19	4.10

Lectures (online)

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
13	2	1	2	0	2	18	4.44

Online Threaded Discussions

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
12	5	1	1	0	1	19	4.47

Individual Projects/Exercises/Assessments (Graded)

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
16	4	0	0	0	0	20	4.80

Collaborative Projects/Exercises/Assessments (Graded)

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
8	6	1	0	0	5	15	4.46

Peer Exchanges Online

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
11	8	0	0	0	1	19	4.57

Self-Checking Online Quizzes/Exercises (Not Graded)

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
9	2	2	1	0	6	14	4.35

Test/Quizzes (Graded)

Often Useful	Sometimes Useful	Undecided/Neutral	Rarely Useful	Never Useful	N/A	n=	Mean
11	2	2	0	0	5	15	4.60

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please indicate the choice that best describes your opinion on the following statements.

5. The course content was clearly and accurately presented.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
10	7	1	2	0	20	4.25

6. The course content was well organized.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
11	7	0	2	0	20	4.35

7. Students understood the criteria that were used to evaluate their assignments.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
9	7	1	3	0	20	4.10

8. During the course students had sufficient feedback about the quality of their participation in discussion.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
7	10	1	2	0	20	4.10

9. During the course students had sufficient feedback about the quality of their coursework.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
10	10	0	0	0	20	4.50

10. The course assessments (e.g. graded activities, tests, quizzes) effectively measured student achievement in this course.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
10	7	1	1	1	20	4.20

11. Students clearly understood the course goals and objectives.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
9	6	2	3	0	20	4.05

12. Lead Faculty provided me enough guidance to grade student assignments consistently.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	n=	Mean
11	6	2	0	0	19	4.47

13. Do you have any suggestions for how or if ODDL should improve mentor support?

14. Please comment on the value of the Mentor Resource Website?

15. Please comment on the value of the Mentor Handbook?

Copyright 2002 Mary Stevenson

Office of Educatonal Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Blanket)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

All Publications:	✓		
Series:			
Division/Department Publication (Specify):		Publication Date:	✓

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options below and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Mary J. Stevenson TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
⊘	○	○
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Mary J. Stevenson	Printed Name/Position/Title: Mary J. Stevenson, Research Assoc. Learning Systems Institute, FSU
Organization/Address: 3644 Barbary Drive Tallahassee, FL 32309-3002	Telephone: 850/893-2462 FAX:
	E-mail Address: dstevens@ unr.net Date: 2002

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)